

**CLARK COUNTY PLANNING COMMISSION
MINUTES OF PUBLIC HEARING
THURSDAY, JANUARY 19, 2006**

Public Services Building
BOCC Hearing Room
1300 Franklin Street, 6th Floor
Vancouver, WA

CALL TO ORDER

The public hearing of the Clark County Planning Commission was called to order at 6:30 p.m. by Chair, Vaughn Lein. The hearing was held at the Public Services Building, BOCC Hearing Room, 1300 Franklin Street, 6th Floor, Vancouver, Washington.

ROLL CALL

Planning Commission Present: Vaughn Lein, Chair; Jeff Wriston, Vice Chair; Dick Deleissegues, Lonnie Moss, Carey Smith, and Jada Rupley.

Planning Commission Absent: Ron Barca.

Staff Present: Marty Snell, Long Range Manager; Rich Lowry, Chief Deputy Prosecuting Attorney; Gary Albrecht, Planner II; Colete Anderson, Planner III; Bob Higbie, Assistant Long Range Manager; Michael Butts, Development Services Manager; and Sonja Wiser, Administrative Assistant.

Other: Cindy Holley, Court Reporter.

GENERAL & NEW BUSINESS

A. Approval of Agenda for Thursday, January 19, 2006

The agenda for Thursday, January 19, 2006, was approved as distributed.

B. Approval of Minutes for October 20 & November 17, 2005

It was **MOVED** by Dick Deleissegues and **Seconded** by Jada Rupley to **APPROVE** the Minutes of October 20 and November 17, 2005. **MOTION WAS APPROVED** by unanimous voice vote of all members present.

C. Communications from the Public

None.

PUBLIC HEARING ITEMS & PLANNING COMMISSION ACTION

A. AMEND CLARK COUNTY'S MIXED USE ORDINANCE AND MASTER PLAN ORDINANCE:

The Board of County Commissioners appointed a committee in September 2004 to study the mixed use ordinance. The committee met between September 2004 and January 2006 and developed a draft ordinance to regulate mixed use developments and associated design standards. The ordinances, if adopted, would replace the current mixed use ordinance in CCC 40.230.020 in its entirety and modify CCC 40.520.070 to include mixed use developments. This hearing will be to consider the proposed ordinances.

The draft mixed use ordinance consists of: a statement of purpose; a section on applicability; a definitions section; a table of uses; development standards; credits; and Review and Approval Process. The draft ordinances are available on the county's web page at

<http://www.clark.wa.gov/longrangeplan/projects/mixed-use.html>. Copies of the drafts are also available at Clark County Community Development, Long Range Planning, 1300 Franklin Street, 3rd Floor, Vancouver, Washington.

**Staff Contact: Colete Anderson (360) 397-2375, Ext. 4516
or e-mail: colete.anderson@clark.wa.gov**

LEIN: We will continue on with the agenda item, amend Clark County's mixed use ordinance and master plan. Ms. Anderson, please.

ANDERSON: Good evening. Colete Anderson, Community Development, Long-Range Planning. The mixed use committee and staff are here this evening to bring to you we hope our recent efforts under Phase II of the mixed use project. A little bit of background.

The mixed use project started during the comprehensive plan update back in about 2003. At that time during public testimony it appeared like our mixed use ordinance at that time needed a total revamp. The Board in their infinite wisdom when they adopted the September 2004 map decided that they would like to extend adopting a revised mixed use code until it had a more special attention to it. They then appointed an eight member community advisory committee made up of a variety of citizens from the financing, development and neighborhood groups. They initially looked at the mixed use draft that staff had proposed during the comprehensive plan time frame and made some modifications to it in time to have it adopted for December of '04. At that time we came before the Planning Commission and both groups recommended to the Board that a more intense look on the design component of the mixed use ordinance was still

necessary, and given the time constraints that the Board had placed on us at that time we recommended to the Board to put interim mixed use code in place, which is what happened.

The Board then after adopting the December of '04 interim mixed use code asked the mixed use committee to continue under Phase II to look at design elements and to bring the code up to where we would like it to be. They have diligently been working since March of '05. They've done site visits to the various mixed use properties. They've done site visits also in Portland. They've met seven different times. They've invited developers to a forum in July. They did a public outreach workshop where 40 people attended in September. They've also been before the Planning Commission in workshop updates twice this past Fall. The design standards that are before you this evening have been out for public review in various iterations since the first part of December. We've -- as we were receiving comments we've been updating and what's before you this evening is our best conglomeration of where we are today.

At this point I would like to introduce to you two of our mixed use committee members. Can you, there you go. George is going to lead off for us this evening so to talk with you a little bit about what the mixed use committee felt during this process and the approach that they took in developing the standards and the mixed use and master plan code revisions for you this evening.

AUDIENCE: Excuse me, we can't hear what you're saying back here. I don't know if your microphones are on or not, but none of us can hear you.

LEIN: Okay. Thank you for letting us know that.

VARTANIAN: George Vartanian, 2217 NE 179th Street, Unit 5 up in Ridgefield next to the fairgrounds or near the fairgrounds. Basically the mixed use citizens advisory committee, I guess that's what we're called, had been meeting a number of times and our overall objectives were to make a good livable community, something with walkability capabilities, and to perhaps tie in divergent large areas of single-family housing into a community center or a village center or something that would attract the area to come in.

LEIN: Okay. It's fading there, George.

VARTANIAN: Oh, I'm sorry. Yeah, I'm only five foot six.

LEIN: Okay. It may not be you, George, it just may be that the sound system is doing it.

VARTANIAN: Okay. So basically what we tried to do is to have a combination of residential and nonresidential uses which would add flexibility to the land use so that rather than just having areas that were exclusively given to residential or nonresidential you could get more out of the area --

AUDIENCE: We just can't hear what's going on. You're talking to yourselves.

VARTANIAN: Should I start over now?

LEIN: No, just continue.

VARTANIAN: So basically what we're trying, what we were trying to do is to get a walkable neighborhood area, something that would draw the people in from the various areas surrounding it knowing that there would be a lot of single-family housing around the mixed use areas where people could come and either recreate or shop or just take advantage of the various design facilities of the mixed use areas while not having to go too far. As we know the development in Clark County is generally very, oh, I don't want to use the term sprawl because I'm not quite sure I know what that means, but divergent and there's no facility to tie all the areas together.

So what we're thinking is that perhaps if we could provide shopping, recreational facilities somewhere either within walking distance or not too distant to take an automobile people would be able to use it without having to go too far overdoing the roads and especially with fuel costs what they are these days. So basically I think the committee was trying to make something that was pleasant, easy to live with, reasonable we think given what the developers have been telling us to do to build that would make an attractive area that people could come and live and be happy.

WORTHY: Well, I'll add on. I'm Mike Worthy. I live in Hazel Dell, Employed at the Bank of Clark County here in Vancouver. George defined pretty specifically the committee's agenda. I'll admit, though, that I came with my suit with a little different set of responsibilities in representing the business community, was asked by the Chamber of Commerce to sit in on this particular committee task, and I came at the scenario from a little different point of view, one being that the types of complaints that were expressed by business people around trying to develop these types of properties in these zones really needed some clarification and there were factions that said this zone just is not going to evolve because no one can figure out how to build an economically viable project in any of these areas. So on that theme also of economic viability we've tried to apply some thinking about what would motivate developers to come into these particular zones and make substantive investments that could help this part of the community evolve.

I think the first thing is what we're hearing now from the development community is that the standards that are before you are specific enough that you understand what your challenges are going to be if you choose to take on a development in those areas. I personally would not say this is the type of zone that a first time developer should take a swing at given the complexity of the requirements as opposed to perhaps other types of simplistic development, but for those that have experience in this type of development their response to these standards is that in fact they're clear, that they're flexible, that

with some accommodations for the particular peculiarities of any given site there's ample flexibility to be able to evolve a project on these sites. The question of economic viability evolves to what are you going to pay for the real estate in part, and that's a wild card any way you want to look at it, but it also implies that in the future the development in the adjacent zones, and this, these parts of the community as they evolve, evolve outside of these particular zones is going to suggest business opportunity in many of these parcels. And I think the feedback we have so far is that those parties now willing to go forward seeing the standards more clearly and acquire these properties from others to elevate the use are doing so in anticipation of the evolution of the community around these zones in addition to their own business interest in the specific developments that they're contemplating.

So I can say with confidence that, A, in my outreach to business leaders and developers I haven't had any resistance at all to the proposed standards. The general tone is far superior to the previous set of instructions. There are always factions that say can't we just throw this out and whisper we're going to come in for a rezone anyway, which is a challenge that the County would face in any circumstance if that was the developer's intent. So I'd say that there hasn't been any substantive negative feedback at all from the business and development community, and in fact some that I consider to be pretty credible developers who have done these type of projects are nodding agreement that this would be easy to understand and interpret, and if we were inclined to go after any of these particular properties, we would know what to do. So to my thinking the committee has achieved its objective. As I had thought of it and as George expressed, we also believe that there are plenty of adequate safeguards relative to the adjacent neighborhoods that they should be able to provide input and confident that they'll evolve in a way that's consistent with those neighborhoods. I've also heard that in the context of design standards as they're integrated into this proposal, this is further than many other County efforts have gone before, and I think George and I would agree that there's a comfort level amongst committee members that this is the right thing to do for these zones.

LEIN: Any questions of Mr. Vartanian and Mr. Worthy? I'd like to compliment you as well as your entire committee for the time and effort you've put into this, it's not an easy task to take on a mixed use development, and I think we've had some good consultants with the County to be able to work through some of the ideas, whether this body agrees, who knows what's going to happen here. George, do you have a comment?

VARTANIAN: Just very quickly more administrative in manner. The other, if you will, civilians of the committee all have really good excuses for not being here, one's mother is sick and one's going to the hospital for a hip replacement and an annexation hearing, so there's, you know, the interest was there but they had really other commitments so.

RUPLEY: You were tough on your committee, George.

VARTANIAN: Hey, my friend (inaudible) came and talked to them.

LEIN: Are there any questions of these two gentlemen at this time? Thank you very much.

WORTHY: Great. Thank you.

LEIN: Ms. Anderson.

ANDERSON: I'm going to now turn over the rest of the presentation to Bob Bengford from Makers our consultant on this project as he goes through the design standards components of this and we'll get into some code text descriptions a little bit later.

BENGFORD: Good evening, Commissioners. Can everyone hear me? Well, I'd also like to say it's been a pleasure working with both staff and the committee. I think this is an exciting project and I think it's -- I think this could do a lot of great things for the county and what I'd like to do here is just to summarize some of the key things. I know that I've given you most of the same presentation before so bear with me.

But the first thing on here that we've tried to do, and it's pretty much reiterating what George and Mike said, is we're trying to strike a balance to address -- to create some quality design as identified by the community throughout the process. We're also trying to create some flexibility and make this code viable and also to make it predictable and really easy to use and that's what -- particularly what we've tried to do with the code language and the documents themselves and providing a lot of graphics. In fact that leads into the next slide here. Why is this all so big.

Well, as the committee members said this is very complex, especially when you're looking at mixing uses and you're looking at dealing with how to put a pedestrian pathway through parking lots, how to deal with a lot of these issues, integrating open space, looking at signage and housing types from single-family, multi-family, there's quite a few issues so there's lots of things to cover, but I believe we've done it in a way that is very clear so. Some of the issues that have been addressed by the community in this process were the proper mixes of uses and density levels, open space was really important, and I'll talk about those in a bit, again how to create a pedestrian friendly environment when most of the development is going to be served by surface parking lots most likely, and then also addressing some design issues on including single-family uses which were not allowed under the current ordinance, and that's a big deal, and also providing enough specificity for staff and the applicant so everybody knows what they can do and cannot do. And another thing with design standards, you can't always prevent bad design but what you really try to do is prevent the worst and the unacceptable things and so I think that's what we've done here and so now we can get into the ordinance recommendations.

I'm going to go through these really quick and then I'm going to go into the design standards part and first of all what's applicable. And a couple of things, these standards supplement the other codes that are in Clark County Code and when there is a conflict

that what we said here is that the more specific standard applies. Since these standards are specific to this mixed use district, these are usually going to be the more specific ones that will apply so it's important to make that clear. The other thing is this applies to all new development and that includes both master plan subdivisions and new construction, so they all have to take a look at this. So again mixed, the unique thing here is that you're requiring a mix of uses on each property and it's important to say that this can be both vertical mixed use with retail or offices or public uses on the ground floor and maybe residential above or it can be side-by-side and I think this is given where the properties might be and where the County is right now in the marketplace and property values, that's important in the fact that you can do horizontal and side-by-side mixed use and add some flexibility to what can be done on each piece of property.

So the mix of uses right now you have what the code says is that you have to have at least 20 percent of the site has to be residential all, on the other side at least 20 percent has to be nonresidential and we've decided to pretty much stick with that; however, we have kind of tinkered with being that we think that getting the 20 percent nonresidential is probably going to be the more difficult thing in a lot of cases. We've allowed a little bit more flexibility so on if you have a smaller site, less than two acres in some cases, there's some flexibility that you can go a little bit under that if you include some vertical mixed use, and also the way the calculations are done for when you have mixed use development it allows a little bit of flexibility and what it tries to do is essentially encourage developments to mix the uses vertically, but it doesn't force them to.

So the next slide on here that's also important is that we've decided in the proposal to add single-family to be a possible permitted use here and to do that we've come up with some compromises that I think thus far we've -- the committee and the public has agreed on, and that's that no more than 30 percent of the total dwelling units can be single-family dwelling units. And the other thing is we've upped the density. Currently there's a minimum of 12 dwelling units per acre, and we're talking about acres that are in resident, the part of the site that's in residential use, and we've upped that to 18 to try and get more, more density, more dwelling units, more housing that then supports the commercial uses that are in the district.

Commercial, speaking of commercial uses, we also talked about some of the big box, large scale retail uses, and for the most part the committee agreed that these large scale commercial uses are more regional in character and maybe they don't belong in these mixed use centers since you're trying to create this neighborhood center, smaller, smaller scale focused kind of atmosphere that we've stuck with. In the current ordinance there's already some things that limit the size and for the most part we've kept those pretty similar, we've tinkered with some of the numbers and you can see on the screen there that for grocery stores for instance we allow up to 35,000-square feet outright, if you have a larger site you can go a little bit bigger, and we've done similar things with hardware stores and single purpose stores. One thing that we did was stores could actually go a little bit bigger if they go up, so someone could actually build a -- let's say a business wants to build a 150,000-square foot retail store or a hardware

store, they can do that if part of it is on the second floor so the building footprint is limited to say 100,000-square feet, so there's some flexibility we believe that's built into this. The whole goal there is making sure that it's not completely out of scale and that it fits into the context of what we're trying to create with this district. The next slide.

So the residential density and uses, again we've increased the density a little bit and given the types of uses that it allows here from you're probably going to see a lot of town homes like two or three-story apartment buildings and maybe down the road in some of the more dense developments you might see three or four floors like the image to the left on the screen there. So we believe that mixing some of these housing types that you can achieve the 18 dwelling units per acre in the marketplace here. The maximum, it stays the same as current and that's 43 dwelling units per acre; however, there's no -- we've said that there's no limit if you have vertical mixed use like the image on your left here in downtown Vancouver, which by the way is probably more than 43 units per acre, if you have a development like that with commercial on the ground floor, residential above, then there is no limit, you can do whatever it is as long as you don't exceed some of the height limits which are about six floors.

The other thing is there's more flexibility on setbacks in the current ordinance, in the proposed ordinance and most for the most part the standards let the -- the ordinance let's the design standards address those issues. The next slide. Another issue on here is that there's some small couple minor editing changes from your packet and, Colete, if you want to mention a few of those.

ANDERSON: Right. In front of you tonight you should have a kind of an errata sheet that explains some of the differences from your packet to what we found through further review, they're not substantive changes at all, it's mostly scrivener's components, and I too would like to -- I would like to remove the first two on here, it's for since further review we decided our first footnote Number 7 is actually correct, so we've swung back the other way 180 degrees. So I wasn't sure whether or not you would like to review this or have me read it into the record or if we could do their nature of scrivener's notes if it was fine the way it was.

LEIN: If they're not dramatically impacting what's going on, it's probably fine just to be an attachment to the material if it goes on to the Board.

ANDERSON: Thank you.

BENGFORD: The next slide. So now I'd like to talk a little bit about the design standards, and this will be actually Appendix D of Title 40, we've decided to since there are a lot of graphics and we'd like to do some things to make it easy to understand we went the route of making this a separate document but it is part of Title 40. So the next slide. So a couple of things we've done here is include some -- a lot of images and things that came out of the process and one of them we've included like here you see a couple of mixed use development examples and these are three of the five that we used

in our public meetings to evaluate what people liked and didn't like about some of these other developments and find out what would be acceptable in Clark County in these mixed use zones. So these are in the design standards for reference for people to take a look at. The next slide.

Similarly we've also included the results of the Visual Preference Surveys, which are always interesting, and here I just think it's great for people to see these images and this way especially developers coming in from out of town can see the types of things that the community wants in their neighborhood and things that they don't want. The next slide. And the last introduction thing here was housing types and I think it's important to show what are some of the desirable types of housing types that can fit within this district under the ordinance. So we have several sheets that talk about things like mid-rise housing all the way down to cottage housing and just to let people know how these might be laid out, what are some of the key applicable standards to just kind of give them some information when they're thinking about what they can do. The next slide.

So as I mentioned before, open space we found was really critical to the community and the committee in really making these things work so what we ended up doing is putting this open space stuff right at the beginning of the design standards and saying that all of these, any such mixed use development, must incorporate at least some publicly accessible open space. Now how much, the next slide, or actually, and this could be several different types of open space and so you can see here it could be many things like a small village green, it could be a little residential square, it could be a little garden, I think you got some great opportunities for a lot of trails and linear open spaces here especially with your topography and environment. The next slide. So what we came up with we tried to come up with something clear and reasonable here so what it was is for all commercial, public and multi-family uses is that all these developments must set aside 5 percent of the site for publicly accessible open space, so it must be one of those types of open space in the previous slide and there's plenty of standards and direction there on what it can be, but it's trying to be flexible yet clear enough in making sure that there is some good open space that serves as a focal point.

We also addressed single-family areas are a little bit different and we came up with there is 15 percent of the area and we list a few different types of open spaces and came up with a 15 percent from looking at a lot of other good examples and desirable examples. And one of them we had looked at was Fairview Village down in Oregon and although it might be hard to see in the aerial photograph they've incorporated a combination of open spaces whether they're creek corridors, they've also included a bunch of little mini-neighborhood parks, they really make it stand out from other lower density single-family residential developments. The next slide.

Building location orientation was really important and the current standards needed some more clarification on what was really -- what the County really wanted here. So a couple of things. We've said that right now there's a 10-foot setback for instance requirement in the zone, we said, well, why can't you come right up to the street and be

right on it if you have a nice facade, so we've included this thing what we call a pedestrian oriented facade and what that includes is just a store front that has a lot of windows, has some -- a little bit of weather protection and that's where your front entrance is so this phrase is used quite a bit in the document and it's an important one especially for these mixed use zones so. The next slide.

And as far as the building location orientation generally this is what it comes down to, instead of having your store with the parking lot right in the front the objective here is to get the building up in the front and the parking in the back. Now when you have bigger sites, the next slide, Gary, when you have bigger sites you need a little more flexibility on this so what we've said is for these bigger sites where you have multiple buildings you can't have more than half of your frontage be parking lot or vehicle access. So you can see in this image that we've placed some of the buildings up front, but we still allowed for some parking to be visible adjacent to the street and so that provides -- people know where the parking is but at the same time it's a little bit more pedestrian friendly because you got some buildings up there and I think it will make a big difference in what these areas will look like. Blank walls are also critical in this. The proposed standards are pretty similar to your current, you basically can't have any blank walls and the standards tell you what you can do to treat them and there's an example on the left and on the right is a picture that Colette sent to me as a good example from like say the back of a grocery store and how they treated it along the street. The next slide.

The street layout was really important also and there was really no direction in the current ordinance and so what we did we came up with some standards to try and create kind of a modified grid network of streets that that's a little more pedestrian oriented and we tried to make sure that it's connected to the system outside of the site. And so this example here the gray are the roads there and it shows the example of how that could work and so we came up with some cross-circulation standards of how big blocks can be and you could have a bigger block for instance if you have a park in it or some open space. The next slide. We've also addressed the street design and try to promote more pedestrian friendly streets by including traffic calming measures and encouraging a lot of landscaping, making sure that the sidewalks are sufficient width, lighting, also accommodating transit and bicycles and pedestrian amenities. The next slide.

So this is just an example, let's say this could be the cart of a mixed use district where you have things like curb extensions near the corner, you might have colored crosswalks or highlighted crosswalks. And also some other things are when you bring buildings up close to the street, it tends to slow cars down a little bit so the standards talk about quite a -- all of those things and provide plenty of examples. The next slide.

Building design, we went through a couple of issues and one of them is entries are really important so we came up with some standards that all -- for instance all primary entries must have some weather protection. Secondary entrances are important if you have, and a lot of these new commercial developments where you're trying to get the retail business up on the street you also have the parking in the back and it's important

to have both entrances be relatively nice, so we've had some standards for those secondary entrances and also entrances for some of the housing developments are really important also and we've addressed those. Next. Another important thing on building design is right now the standards say for facades it must -- you must have visually interesting things every 15 feet, but it doesn't really say what those are. Here I think we've specified it a little bit more clear and said for most streets every 70 feet you need to include some type of articulation or modulation feature and we provide a tool box of how you can do that and these two buildings show examples of how that can be done, whether it's the way you put the windows, your weather protection, building modulation or a roof line modulation, those are some examples. The next slide. We talked the design standards cover building materials a little bit and talk about for instance if you have stucco or metal siding that you must have for instance brick or more permanent, more harder material near the ground floor for instance, so there's a number of things there to make sure that if you use certain materials that they're treated well and designed well. The next slide.

There's some standards also on landscaping, fencing and screening that address for instance the area between the street and any parking area, how much landscaping you need, what type of and how many trees, how often. The next slide. It also address signage and tries to get away from pole signs or these other tall monument signs with numerous entries, and go to the next slide here, and it tries to get a little bit more to signs that aren't so much backlit, a little more pedestrian friendly. They may not necessarily be smaller but they're better designed signs, so I won't go into any more detail there.

And lastly there's a chapter on single-family dwellings and development and I just chose a couple of the slides here that emphasize some of the key things and the one on the left just shows how your garage must be set back a little bit, at least 18 feet from the street or the sidewalk, also requiring some type of covered entry and windows on the street for each home, there's some standards on driveways making sure you don't have a triple car wide driveway coming all the way up to the street and having it be one continuous curb cut for the district and in there there's also some standards in there on accessory dwelling units and cottage housing. So I think I've said enough here and I think I'll turn it over.

ANDERSON: And that pretty much summarizes where we've been. We have before you the mixed use code edits where we took out the standards and incorporated them in the appended document, we've made a few minor changes to the use list and we expanded on how the number of acreage for certain categories could be, for example, 20 acres or greater. We've incorporated a master planning component if you're looking at doing phasing for a mixed use development, so subsequently the master planning development code was changed just to incorporate mixed use as an option. The other thing that we provided this evening is a summary sheet that highlights the differences in a snapshot between the two different ordinances.

LEIN: I don't think we have that.

ANDERSON: We had it copied for you this evening.

LEIN: Thank you.

ANDERSON: We've incorporated most of the changes to the code between the interim ordinance and the proposal this evening throughout the presentation that Makers did for you. Any questions?

LEIN: Any questions of Ms. Anderson or Bob at this time?

SMITH: Does this include the approval process? You didn't really talk about that.

HIGBIE: It's a site plan review process but basically it's an administrative.

SMITH: It's a little different.

LEIN: Bob, you're not getting picked up.

HIGBIE: Can you hear me now? Can you hear me now?

ANDERSON: It's a Type 3.

HIGBIE: It's a Type 3 which requires a public hearing before the Hearing Examiner.

SMITH: All the same. But one thing that bounced off me, and maybe it's the normal one, that the applicant for a proposed mixed use development shall certify that two or more of the following have been involved with the preparation and that could be a landscaper, an architect, an arborist. Is that normal for all Type 3?

HIGBIE: No.

SMITH: I thought that was a little strange that you could come before with only a landscaper and an arborist and not have an engineer or a -- it's two of the four you can come forward with which means you could have an arborist and a landscaper.

HIGBIE: At some point in the development process you will need engineers for the design of the drainage systems and that sort of thing, but, yeah, up front for the original it's like for a subdivision hearing, you're looking at lot size and some of the bigger picture items before you get to the nuts and bolts, you know, if you have a two percent slope or whatever you're talking about that the engineers get involved with.

SMITH: Okay. But bringing those two gets you in the door.

LEIN: Any other questions?

MOSS: I have a question related to density. I'm trying to understand how this might work if you had the requirement for R-18, 18 units per acre overall for the average density for the development. I've just been kind of running some numbers out and trying to see how that might work and in the example, I guess my question is: Have you found in your perusal of other successful mixed use developments, developments which have met this kind of an average density and incorporated the percentage of single-family that you're talking about into the development?

BENGFORD: Yes.

MOSS: Where might we find an example of that?

BENGFORD: Well, in any development that has -- generally if you build town houses for instance probably 80 percent of the time you're going to be over 18 units per acre and the way we've done this is we've just used -- in fact if we could show that one example, Gary, on the screen, we put together, we put together an example on one of the mixed use sites showing how this could be done and generally town homes can typically be built. It's the other one.

ANDERSON: The other one. The last one. The last one.

BENGFORD: (Inaudible) concept. There you go. Town houses for instance can usually be dealt -- developed at 20 to even up to 40 units per acre and so there should be no problem with meeting it there and if you only have 30 percent of your dwelling units are in single-family and you combine that with town homes and apartment buildings and those other types, there shouldn't be a problem in getting to 18 units per acre. The only way you're going to run into problems is if you start trying to create large lot single-family. What this does is forces you to build a little more compact developments.

But the other thing, and it was useful in doing this, this study, and on here is that I needed to clarify that roads and open space don't count against you, you're just looking at the area that's being developed for residential. So in this example in the red is retail/restaurant, in the blue is office, so to meet the 18 dwelling units per acre that part of the site would not be counted if there's no residential on it. So you're just counting the component -- the part that's being developed for residential and you don't have to count the streets and you don't have to count the roads and that.

MOSS: You know, let me illustrate with some numbers if you'd bear with me why I ask the question, and I agree with you, town houses can be built in that range, although 40 units per acre is the really the --

BENGFORD: It's high.

MOSS: -- high end, if you will, let's just assume that you have 100 residential units in your development and that 30 of those are single-family and the other 70 are attached -- single-family detached and the others are attached.

LEIN: Single-family?

MOSS: You have 30 family detached units and 70 other units, okay. Taking that 100 residential units and applying the 18 units per acre average density, just kind of working backwards into this you need a development area of about 5 and a half acres to make that work. This is net developable area. If for single-family detached we assume 8 units per acre, which is a fairly small lot size, not the 7500 that we're talking about in the ordinance is the maximum but about 5,000, if you do that the area required for single-family detached is the 30 units divided by 8 or 3.75 acres out of the 5 and a half acre total, that leaves 1.75 acres for the remaining 70 units, so for those 70 units you need 40 units per acre to make this work.

BENGFORD: No, I think that's a little bit, a little bit off. So you're counting everything?

MOSS: No. I'm only counting the area that's actually developed in both cases. I'm counting the lot size for single-family detached.

BENGFORD: So you have 9 units, 9 units per acre on for the residential.

MOSS: I assumed 8 units per acre on single-family detached so you would eat up 3.75 acres for 30 homes.

BENGFORD: So what you would do in that case, and one thing we have done is, we've included accessory dwelling units, you can have accessory dwelling units for instance with each, with some of those single-family and that's another way to bump your density up.

MOSS: That would be tough on a 5,000-square foot lot though.

BENGFORD: Sure. It's been done though. And so what it forces you to do --

MOSS: I guess my question is in bumping this up to 18 units per acre I'm really wondering whether we aren't pushing the upper limit here and forcing the mix of single-family detached to something well under 30 percent to make this work. I can see how it can work with 10 percent, but why would anybody want to do 10 percent in a development of this kind.

BENGFORD: And that was part of the discussion with the committee is how far do we want to go. The committee was really adamant about wanting a certain amount of density so in some of those cases it might force you to have a little bit smaller lots or it

might force you to have -- well, if I'm going to have 5,000-square foot lots, maybe I'm only -- maybe I can only really get 20 percent single-family on a certain site. It makes you -- it forces you to make some tough decisions, it does, but the objectives here were to try and allow for a little bit of a mix but really make sure that there is some of the densities. So there are some hard choices on it and that's why we came up with those numbers, that's why we also allowed accessory dwelling units to be included as they can be counted as a dwelling unit and that can help bump up your density and meet the 18 requirement.

MOSS: Yeah, I can see that. I'm having a little difficulty imagining putting this into practice. I can see how it would work very easily with R-12, I can see how it would work -- it would be a little tougher with R-15 to get any kind of a decent mix, with R-18 though I think you're practically forced into the upper end densities which may not be appropriate for many of the mixed use zoned areas that we have. 40 units per acre I don't have any difficulty with in downtown Vancouver at all, I do have a little difficulty in some of the outlying areas that we're, that we've applied this mixed use zone to, I have a hard time imagining a successful development that would have that many units per acre in town houses. George.

VARTANIAN: Could I refer to something?

LEIN: Yeah, please, George.

VARTANIAN: Again, still George Vartanian. I guess I would offer that maybe we're looking at it a little bit more dense single-family housing, maybe if 10 per acre, because that seems to be what's going on at least in the (inaudible) environs, number one. And, number two, we're also assuming there's a good chance of having some residential units over the commercial. So that's just about a bonus that you're not paying for in land, you know, so that will easily get to the required density of 18 overall I would think.

MOSS: Thanks.

VARTANIAN: Yeah.

LEIN: Other questions? Mr. Higbie, this pertains to a different kind of project, but we heard Hazel Dell Center and the mixed use out there, can you tell us what happened when that went on to the Board? Has it been to the Board yet?

HIGBIE: I believe that, yes, it has been to the Board. I believe the final action was to eliminate the residential, they've changed it to OR-18. They changed the residential, they decreased the density requirement from 22 to 18, to an OR-18.

LEIN: See, we hadn't heard --

ANDERSON: Some of the parcels went to C-3 and some of the parcels were actually

changed from to OR-18 on the north side of --

LEIN: North side of the site? That's where two of the larger pieces were.

ANDERSON: Right. They changed it so they could be office as well as residential.

LEIN: Did they get rid of the grocery store?

HIGBIE: I think the requirement for the grocery store was eliminated.

LEIN: Okay. Thank you. Any other questions of staff at this time before we open it for public hearing? Okay. Then we'll open it for public comments. Anyone wishing to testify on this issue please come forward and state your name and address for the record.

LEWIS: Good evening, Planning Commissioners, my name's Matt Lewis with Pacific Lifestyle Homes, 11815 NE 99th Street, Suite 1200, Vancouver 98682, and I apologize I have no written remarks to speak off of this evening and I know you're exceptionally disappointed you're not reading one of my memos right now. Nonetheless our company does have an interest in this ordinance. We don't own any of the currently zoned mixed use properties, we are in negotiation with several of the owners right now, and in general we support mixed use and we're excited about sort of stretching our development capacity in a newer area. We do develop a range of residential densities right now, but haven't ventured into commercial and some of the requirements here would be different. We think they're fairly workable; however, we have a few recommendations to the Planning Commission.

The first of those is what Commissioner Moss very succinctly summarized a few minutes ago about the upzoning in the density requirement that took place from the existing ordinance to the current one going from the 12 to the 18. And as Commissioner Moss pointed out, while you do have the 30 percent allowance for single-family, when you have to hit that high of a density, it really pulls you to make single-family very difficult and you move into nearly exclusively attached and there's a range of attached densities, though, that it pushes you towards three-story town homes and probably at least three units in a building mass as opposed to two. None of those are bad in and of themselves, just illustrating that housing options and housing diversity is limited with this density size.

And then when you look at the location of the properties all along the urban fringe, some abutting, most of them abutting potentially large transportation corridors, although they're underdeveloped right now, and most of them adjacent to low density single-family if not other rural uses, you begin to wonder about pushing the density that high. We are currently developing or have just finished new home communities in Clark County in properties that were zoned R-18 and you're allowed to develop those to a minimum of 12 units, which we've done, and sure enough what do most of the citizens

say when they drive by those communities, why did that builder put so many homes in there. And as I point out, we developed those to the minimum density possible and did some zero lot line and cottage and the porches are up and they look good and they still offer a yard and some usable outdoor open space for the homeowners, which people desire, they truly desire that, so we would recommend going back to the 12, 14 to 16 you're still, it's a stretch but it at least allows the opportunity for more diversity in housing type.

A question on the 15 percent requirement for open space on the single-family detached. If I read that correctly it looked like the commercial and multi-family was about 5 percent of the net developable area and then the single-family detached at 15 percent seemed a little odd considering the single-family detached provides private open space within the yards than to have that larger percentage for open space seemed to be counter-intuitive, not that some level of open space requirement is not completely reasonable. To be candid, the ordinance is quite prescriptive. Obviously when you have design standards 40 or so pages it's not exactly extremely flexible; however, most of those are reasonable and we wouldn't contest developing under those conditions. A couple of them you have to question the public interest they're achieving though. The floor area ratio requirement if I understand it correctly of .5 for the single-family detached essentially is trying to prevent big homes on small lots. Is that a fair way to characterize the intent there? So if you have a 4,000-square foot lot, the maximum home size you can have is 2,000-square feet?

BENGFORD: Correct.

LEWIS: And with that small of a lot and then you're -- that would be two stories. From the market standpoint people desire square footage. Good or bad Americans consumerism is a different story, that's what they want, especially those with families which are a large segment of the market. In the push for density under growth management you have smaller lots still attempting to provide that square footage for them, I wonder what is achieved in capping that assuming that the other design criteria are met so you still have an attractive product and a good looking street scape. I didn't see a provision for zero lot line development, I don't know if I missed that.

BENGFORD: There is. There is.

LEWIS: Okay, there is. And then on the cottage housing, innovative product, there's some potential there. It seemed that the criteria became extremely prescriptive for that particular housing product as far as the square footages that were capped and the configuration and some of the other things. So I'd just encourage the Planning Commission to look at in the effort to incent innovative and diverse development if you're overly prescriptive you can hinder how creative people can be. That concludes my remarks and I'd be happy to answer any questions.

LEIN: Questions of Mr. Lewis?

RUPLEY: Matt, I have a question. It seemed like most of what your concerns were back to creating more options again for the single-family houses. Is that kind of the line of your testimony, that you felt that we're too prescriptive in these on the upper end or on the single-family?

LEWIS: From the density standpoint, not on the design standpoint. I think the (inaudible) loaded porches, articulation on the rear or the front, that's reasonable enough, it was really the density which prescribes a certain housing product essentially when you have a density at that high.

RUPLEY: Because I wondered about people who this would be an attractive development or living place for them if the square footage really was truly as important as it is to some families and I suspect not, that that's part of that downsizing mode so, yes.

LEWIS: And it wouldn't be our intention -- obviously if we were to develop land like this we know that we're not developing the same product type for the -- or for the same demographic that we would be in R1-7.5 and 7500-square foot lots, there would be different market segments within a mixed use project; however, that doesn't change what the overall market is and what segments still need to be catered to and isn't it desirable to have a mixed income, mixed age, mixed life-style community. I would think it would be; however, when you prescribe certain housing density; i.e., a certain housing type, you limit the diversity there.

RUPLEY: Okay. Thanks.

LEWIS: Thank you.

LEIN: Thank you, Matt.

RETURN TO PLANNING COMMISSION

LEIN: Any other public testimony? If not, we'll return it to the Planning Commission. Questions of staff? Comments from members of the Commission?

DELEISSEGUES: I guess my comment is I have to kind of agree with some of the testimony that when you get too prescriptive in so-called standards, you almost drive the product into a standard of itself without giving any flexibility to some difference in the appearance of the development or the mix of use in the development. For example, if the density's too great to allow families because the homes have to be so small, then we require playgrounds, open space, parks, but who's going to use them. I mean you have the larger homes that accommodate families, then I think the neighborhood parks and so forth would be more fitting in that design and that combination of amenities that you would have in your community.

And I had some other, these are concerns, but it seems like the density almost drives the design. If your density requirements are so difficult to meet that only a certain design, three-story townhouse, whatever, is going to be able to meet that requirement, then that's all we're going to have and it almost defeats the purpose of having a mix and as in mixed use result from your project. It seems to me also that this design features that we're talking about are more appropriate in the urban setting than they would be in suburban and certainly more than in rural and that there should be some transition in the standards as you move out to the less dense populated areas in the county. It seems to lack flexibility to me.

And then I didn't see a whole lot about how we're going to incorporate ADA into some of these requirements for a three-story and two-story and a family housing over the top of commercial and so forth, that's another issue that is going to certainly have to be met in any construction that goes on. So those are just some of the concerns I have and I'm sure that the more creative planners and developers can meet all of these, but I don't think I could.

LEIN: Other comments? Bob, do you want to respond maybe to a couple of the things here so far?

BENGFORD: Sure. Sure. Again, the single-family issue we've had some good discussions on it and, again, it's not allowed in the current ordinance and we came up with the compromises that we did, 30 percent and all and the 18 units per acre. One of the things was single-family is allowed almost everywhere else and what the committee really was adamant about is there's maybe there should be some areas where there just isn't that much of it, and they also recognize that this is an urban area, the County has designated these boundaries and these fall within this urbanized area, and one of the things we've done is we're looking at not just development in the next 5 years, we're looking at 25, 50 more years down the road and creating some special opportunities here.

So the 18 units per acre was part of that compromise of allowing -- if we're going to allow some single-family in, we need to do some compromises here, but single-family shouldn't be the driver of these districts, that there should be some areas that aren't solely single-family. And if you look at the land use map of the whole county, a lot of area is you can have single-family developments and to make these mixed use areas successful you're going to need density. And we keep hearing this in all the communities that we're working with, especially in Puget Sound, as cities are having difficulty in getting revenue sales tax from retail and commercial uses is so important and to get that you need more density in some of these areas, especially in mixed use areas.

So I think that was what really the -- I mean we had a good discussion on that 18 units per acre and the committee was really adamant about keeping that, that number where

it is. The 15 percent open space, it's a good question, and, again, I got that from looking at a lot of good examples that were more neighborhood center oriented that they had a little bit more community open space in them. And also the 15 percent is suggested in -- there's some -- Washington State put out some like preferred code, development code and development regulation standards for pedestrian oriented communities and 15 percent was a number used there and after looking at aerial photographs and many other examples of good single-family developments they had about that much and so that's where that comes from.

FAR is another good question. You know, the smallest single-family lot, you know, you might see 4,000-square feet, that's pretty small, but that still allows a 2,000-square foot home. I know a lot of the new houses built in my neighborhood are like 3500-square foot, I live in a 1600-square foot home and I still have -- I have three bedrooms and an office and that, that's not that small, and I think if you have a 5,000-square foot lot that allows a 2500-square foot home and in these districts, again, it was talked about creating something that's kind of in scale and not overly bulky for the size of the lot.

The other thing it does is it allows housing to be a little bit more affordable in these areas by having that .5 FAR, so that's where that came from. And the cottage housing ordinance I think I talked about this a little last time, I had done a lot of research in talking with a lot of the communities up in the Puget Sound that have cottage housing ordinances and some of the things that make them successful and they are smaller than the single-family and they all have some of these very prescriptive rules on them for size, but the open space is really important, where they're oriented to, and the porches and all of those things are very important, but that's a lot of where that came from. And I've done -- I did a lot of research on those and to make those work. Am I missing anything? I think that's -- I think that about covers it.

MOSS: I'm a little confused by some of the comments that you've made and primarily those related to the committee's desire to set this apart from single-family areas which are found throughout the county, and I'll acknowledge that they do, we also have multi-family zoning here, but I think the comments that I made weren't directed at the number of single-family units that you've allowed, the ordinance clearly allows a mix of 30 percent single-family detached, at no point in time did I hear from anybody tonight that that percentage ought to be higher. The illustration that I was trying to make here was the effect on the attached. If you assume a 30 percent single-family mix, the other 70 percent seems to me that it's higher density than the market currently or in the foreseeable future will support in some of these fringe areas. And I'm not trying to get more single-family in here, I'm trying to get some design standards here or some code provisions which will permit a mix of single-family and detached and attached units that are in a reasonable range.

The illustration that I gave at 8 units per acre of single-family that required us to do 40 units per acre to compensate for that in the other 70 percent, it gives me some concern. I don't think that 40 units per acre is going to fly in the areas where we've got most of

this zoning. That's not to say by the way that this is a bad ordinance, I really want to commend the group for the effort that you've gone through and I think that this is really a giant step forward and I think a good ordinance in general, I just do have those concerns about what the final product is going to be here.

LEIN: Other comments? I've got a couple. I think Matt brought up one thing that, you know, he says many of these properties are in the urban fringe and there's a lot of single-family or maybe other types of development associated with them, but, Bob, in some of the stuff that you've shown us doesn't the existing single-family have the ability to take advantage of the open space as well as the commercial space that's being provided in these areas so in a way it's beneficial to them in the long run without having -- they'll complain about potentially the traffic produced by that immediate area, but there's still some benefits to them; is that correct?

BENGFORD: Correct.

LEIN: Okay. When the idea of the square footages comes up, you know, having been on here quite a while we used to deal with the small lots at 7500-square feet, you know, there's been a lot of changes in the years, and now we're talking 4,000-square foot lots, we're also talking higher density, we're not going to be a downtown Portland with this and I think when I first looked at that that was part of the criticism I had, that locating some of these mixed use areas out in our county would not produce something that is downtown Portland, well, it's not going to be a downtown Portland, it's going to be unique to our facility and probably to the adjacent land around it.

So I think this provides maybe not something that can be used immediately, but I think as people come forward and maybe get away from the larger homes, there's some homes going up by me that, darn, you can reach out your bathroom door or bathroom window and shake hands with your neighbor because the square footage of the homes are fairly large on very small lots, the streets are not standard streets, it must be a PUD of some kind because it's very narrow streets, you can't -- I don't see how you could park a car on the street because you couldn't get another car behind it, but it all meets the ordinances and zoning that's required by it, but, you know, people are buying it and there's a market there, well, maybe this market's not available today, but it may be available in two years, it may be available in five years and I think we need to be a little bit visionary in trying to create some standards that provides some flexibility out in the future and I think this set of standards is well done.

When you start getting developers like Kassab and Gramor saying although they may not do these or they're not their highest ways of wanting to develop areas but they're complimenting something like this, then I'm more apt to say the job has been well done. Mike Worthy indicated that with his information he's received from developers they don't have problems with it, I think that there's people willing to take this on, it may not be today but that it's a well done mixed use design and I think it's something that we should be able to in my mind send on to the Board. Any other comments?

WRISTON: My only comments, I think that you guys have done a great, both staff and the committee, have done a great job. I think it's a long way from where we've been in the where the current ordinance is and also where we've been in the past. I do have concerns over the 12, 13, 14 versus the 18 simply because of diversity in the community that the mix of desires, the mix of incomes, the mix of expectations. I just happened to be reading a, I think, if I can't, I can't tell you that it was the most recent but I think it was the most recent I just picked it up Sunset Magazine had a kind of an interesting vote of desirable communities in the West and they had several classifications and Orenco Station came up actually as one of the -- under one of the classifications came up as one of the best.

But I did pick up on one of the mixed use, they had a map similar to the one that you put together where they showed a mix of single-family but some of them were on the fringes, some of them were large lot and then smaller and then town homes and they were trying to create a sense of community I mean is what they were trying to do. It's so that you don't have people that are all in smaller spaces that maybe don't have two or three kids, you know, you've got the retired people, you've got the people that don't have kids, you've got the people that have kids that need larger yards and you've got all this and so they were -- I think that's -- you'd have to look at it yourself, but what I took away from it was the reason, and the way they did it I think was some kind of a poll or a vote of the readership or something, I don't know, but what I took from it was that what everyone liked in this was that there was a sense of community and you had this mix of people and the more prescriptive we are and the more restrictive we are I think you lose a bit of that, that mix, but for the most part we've come a long way, but I do have a concern. I'd prefer more of the 12 to 13 to 14 range as we've heard testimony tonight.

But other than that, you know, I caution being too prescriptive. I agreed with I think Matt that the cottage part of it is a little prescriptive. I always warn how these things are going to be, you know, they're great ordinances if it just depends on how they're administered, it depends how the developer approaches them, and just as importantly, if not more importantly, how the County approaches them because when you take something this prescriptive there is a lot of flexibility, you can read a lot every flexibility in there, you can read a lot of inflexibility in there and it's going to be up to staff to interpret it and hopefully in a flexible way so that we get -- because these are neat communities, when you see the ones that work they're neat communities, they really are, and hopefully we'll see some that work, but if we don't interpret this -- in my opinion if we interpret this inflexibly we're going to see some one's that maybe don't work.

Other than that maybe consider on the open space it already seems like if we keep the 18 on the single-family and then also impose a 15 percent open space average, then maybe we're again penalizing that aspect of it. And I understand the need for density but maybe average the 15 percent and the 5 percent to single-family versus the commercial and multi-family and all of that so that, again, you're trying to create a community so maybe there's a happy median there where there's a mix of shared open

space. I noticed in a lot of your pictures that some of your open space was open space in front of say a Starbucks or something like that, you know, there was an open space that you wouldn't traditionally think of as being a park and things like that, but I think you were saying that that was considered open space or maybe combine the two, I don't know, but for the most part this has come a long, long way, so good job.

RUPLEY: I'd just like to comment that I like these designs and, Jeff, adults need open space too so maybe in front of Starbucks with that open space that might become an adult only kind of thing as opposed to parks and things like that because you do --

MOSS: You mean Starbucks is going to yellow front store or --

RUPLEY: Yep, you got it. It's the newest stock movement. I like it and I like what the committee has done and I appreciate that they've taken something that needed to be done and go forward with it so I think this creates a good vision for the future of Clark County. We may not see one in the next couple of years, but I think we'll probably see one of these developments happen sooner than most of us think and it will probably fill up sooner than most of us think too.

SMITH: I'd just like to say it's probably the best committee product I've seen in the past 10 years that I've been on the Board and I think they did a really fine job.

WRISTON: Yeah, I would second that. Absolutely. Absolutely.

VARTANIAN: No charge.

RUPLEY: Of course it doesn't have any committee members left.

LEIN: You've paid your dues. Any other comments?

DELEISSEGUES: Well, one specific comment. Under B.2, Street Design, on Number 4 on Page 53 where it talks about radius of 15 feet, you know, as a --

HIGBIE: Are you speaking as a fireman now?

DELEISSEGUES: Reduced -- yeah, I sure am. You know, emergency vehicles have to get through and you're talking about parking on both sides of the street and slowing traffic and I think whoever looks at the specific site plans that come in ought to be at least aware of the fact that fire trucks do require more than 15-foot radius turn and they need to get to both the front and the back of the building.

MOSS: Dick, where was that section that you cited again?

HIGBIE: 53.

DELEISSEGUES: It's under B.2 on Page 53, Number 4.

RUPLEY: Have you thought about fire trucks on motorcycles?

DELEISSEGUES: Not recently.

RUPLEY: That's a good point.

DELEISSEGUES: Now I'd just respond to Vaughn's comment where he said maybe these can't be used immediately but out in the future, but I think if there was more flexibility added to some of these requirements, and they do seem restrictive in every sense of the word, that they could be used now, we wouldn't have to wait for a long time if there was a little more flexibility in here and I think it's site dependent. I'd kind of hate to see a prescriptive set of design standards that require a certain product outcome and then we go look for a place to put it. I'd rather go out and find the place that we're going to put something and then design something that fits the location and it just seems that this is counter-productive to that, but if you can find the right spot, then everything else fits fine, I mean it all fits together and I think it will produce a very attractive product, but I'm not sure that it's the right product for every place in the county that we may want to put this.

Maybe the zoning will take care of that, maybe we won't zone something mixed use unless this particular prescription will fit it and if that's the case, then it's a wonderful job, it's very well, well prepared, well thought out, it does fit together and from that standpoint I think the effort was very definitely worth the time that it took and the labor involved and the product is great, that's my only concern, and I hope that the two will fit together, the zoning will fit the product and the product will fit the zoning and then we got it.

LEIN: Yes, Bob.

BENGFORD: If I can comment on the turning radius, they, those the 25-foot one for instance is just is not a requirement, they're just suggestions in certain cases. The way the language says on the previous page is to provide some traffic calming measures including here are some examples, smaller turning radius generally make it make for shorter distances as in crossing the street and the firm has done a lot of work with a lot of transportation firms on projects like this and more and more it's coming to these smaller turning radiuses on these corners. So we're not requiring it and everything needs to be looked at on a case-by-case basis in figuring out for instance whether fire trucks can get through. So I think a lot of that is going to be looked at on a case-by-case, we're not saying you have to have this, but we're trying to say let's see if we can get smaller ones so that we can make it a little more pedestrian friendly, so that's kind of the direction this was going.

DELEISSEGUES: And all I'm doing is suggesting that they keep that in mind when they do look at it.

BENGFORD: Sure.

LEIN: Any other comments?

MOSS: Just one. I've heard some comments of yours, Dick, that I'd like to echo and that's that I don't want to have to wait five years or ten years to make this ordinance work and that's really the thrust of my comments. I'm really pretty excited about doing a mixed use project, I'd like to do one, I really don't want to have to wait until the market catches up here so.

HIGBIE: It may not. I mean we've actually had some inquiries on it from people that appeared to be interested so it may not be.

MOSS: No, the Devil's always in the details, you know, I can't tell you how many times that we've passed an ordinance, though, and then developers come to consultants like I've been for the last several years and say what do you mean this doesn't work, you know, I'd like to make this work out of the box, and really the only flaw that I see in this of any significance at all is just that overall density, I think it's just slightly too high, I think so. Good job.

LEIN: With that entertain a **motion**. Tonight.

MOSS: Yeah, I'll make one. I'll make one. Noting my previous comments not to the contrary I will **recommend** that we **MOVE** his along to the Board of County Commissioners with a **recommendation for APPROVAL** and I'm sure they'll carefully consider all of the comments that they heard tonight.

LEIN: Is there a second?

DELEISSEGUES: I'll **second** it with the hope that they'll consider all the comments they heard tonight.

LEIN: Any other comments? Could we have roll call, please.

ROLL CALL VOTE

MOSS:	AYE
SMITH:	AYE
WRISTON:	AYE
RUPLEY:	AYE
DELEISSEGUES:	AYE
LEIN:	AYE

LEIN: That completes tonight's public hearing agenda.

OLD BUSINESS

None.

NEW BUSINESS

None.

COMMENTS FROM MEMBERS OF THE PLANNING COMMISSION

LEIN: I'd like to thank the members of the Commission and staff for all the years of support that I've been on the Planning Commission. I believe this is supposed to be my last meeting, I've heard otherwise from members of the staff, but I'm not sure if I'll be able to make any other meetings because of some other commitments, but it's been a delight to be able to serve the public, to serve the County and to meet with such professional and good people as this group as well as the other groups I've been meeting with for the last 23 years and I want to thank everybody, appreciate it very much.

ADJOURNMENT

The hearing adjourned at 8:30 p.m.

All proceedings of tonight's hearing are filed in Clark County Community Development/Long Range Planning. The minutes can also be viewed on the Clark County Web Page at

www.co.clark.wa.us/ComDev/LongRange/LRP_PCagenda.asp

Vaughn Lein, Chair

Date

Minutes Transcribed by:
Cindy Holley, Court Reporter
Sonja Wiser, Administrative Assistant

SWMIN 01-19-2006